

### **REMARKS**

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1-20, as amended, are pending in the application. Claims 1-4 and 8-10 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 7 and 11 have been canceled. Claims 12-20 are new. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

### **Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,722,029 (Tomidokoro et al.). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the medium-width detector detects the width of a page only after printing operation has been activated and after a predetermined condition has been detected.

The Examiner states that Tomidokoro et al. discloses at col. 8, lines 24+ an image forming device having a controller that controls a medium-width detector to detect the width of a page of print medium when called by a main routine. One skilled in the art would understand that a "main routine" for a printer would be started after power is first applied to the printer. Consequently, according to the description at col. 8, lines 24+, the specific routine to detect sheet sizes would begin after power is first applied to the printer. There is no disclosure, nor would one skilled in the art understand, that the image forming device waits until a printing operation has been activated to measure the width of the printing medium.

Because Tomidokoro et al. does not disclose that the image forming device waits until a printing operation has been activated to measure the width of the print medium, Applicant submits that Tomidokoro et al. does not anticipate amended claim 1. Accordingly Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since amended claim 1 has been shown to be allowable, claim 8 dependent on amended claim 1 is allowable, at least by its dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection of claim 8.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner objected to claims 2-7, 9 and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but stated that claims 2-7, 9 and 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Amended claim 1 has been shown to be allowable. Claims 2-7, 9 and 10 depend from allowable amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 2-6, 9 and 10, claim 7 having been canceled.

### **New claims 12-20**

New claims 12—14 depend directly from amended claim 1. Since amended claim 1 has been shown to be allowable, claims 12-14 dependent on amended claim 1 are allowable, at least by their dependency.

Independent claim 15 recites a controller that controls a medium-width detector to detect the width of a page of print-medium upon detecting a switching of a medium feed mode. Tomidokoro et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose basing the detection of page width on the switching of a medium feed mode. Accordingly, claim 15 is allowable over Tomidokoro et al. Claims 16-18 depend from claim 15. Since new claim 15 has been shown to be allowable, claims 16-18 dependent on new claim 15 are allowable, at least by their dependency.

Independent claim 19 recites a controller that controls a medium-width detector to detect the width of a page of print-medium when a printing medium operation has been activated for a first time after changing of control of printing operation. Tomidokoro et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose controlling a medium-width detector to detect the width of a page of print-medium when a printing operation has been activated for a first time after changing of control of printing operation. Accordingly, claim 19 is allowable over Tomidokoro et al.

Independent claim 20 recites a controller that controls a medium-width detector that detects the width of a first page of print medium from a second cassette when a cassette-selecting detection section detects switching from a first cassette to the second cassette. Tomidokoro et al. does not teach, suggest or disclose detecting the width of a page of print medium when a cassette selection section switches from a first cassette to a second cassette. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable over Tomidokoro et al.

For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of new claims 12-20.

**Conclusion**

Insofar as the Examiner's objections and rejections have been fully addressed, the instant application, including claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-20 is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 1-6, 8-10 and 11-20 is therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

**YASUO NODA**

November 7, 2005  
(Date)

By: 

**LOUIS SICKLES II**

Registration No. 45,803

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1294

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: lsickles@akingump.com

LS:lcd